UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,114	02/20/2002	Johann Winderl	MAS-FIN-116	6732

7590 06/04/2003

LERNER AND GREENBERG, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480

EXAMINER
MUNSON, GENE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2811	

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/79,114	Applicant(s) J. WINDERL ET AL
	Examiner G. MUNSON	Group Art Unit 2811

—Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

P riod for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2003.

☒ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) 18-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 6-13, 16 is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) 2, 3, 5, 14, 15, 17 is/are objected to.

☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

☐ Th proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:

☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

☐ Information Disclosure Stat ment(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Intervi w Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing R view, PTO-948

☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Claims 18-25 are withdrawn from consideration as being for a non-elected invention, the election having been made *without* traverse in the response, paper No. 10, filed 16 December 2002.

Applicants are required to cancel the non-elected claims as part of a complete response to this office action. Note that cancellation of the non-elected claims would not preclude the later filing of a divisional application on the non-elected invention (35 U.S.C. 120, 121).

Claims 8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The structure of the "dendritic structure" (claim 8), "bonding channel" (claims 11, 12) and "conductor tracks" (claim 13) are unclear from the specification (pages 7-9, 21, 23, 26), which does not enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the structure, and are not shown in the figures (37 CFR 1.83).

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as unpatentable as shown by Dando. See Figure 8 with "plastic composition" 38.

Claims 1, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Dando. It would have been obvious to use a semiconductor chip with "plastic composition" material 38 of Dando (Figure 8), in order to cover the semiconductor edge with an insulating material. It would have been obvious to implement a contact sensor (claim 10) with a semiconductor chip as in Dando.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Dando as in the above rejection further considered with Saitoh. It would have been obvious to use chromium oxide to enhance adhesion between a semiconductor die and plastic as noted as known in Saitoh (column 2, lines 28-36).

Claims 1, 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as unpatentable as shown by Brooks et al. See Figure 12 with "plastic composition" 110.

Claims 1 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as unpatentable as shown by Japanese document 2144946 abstract.

The references are of record.

The arguments in the response, filed 27 May 2003, have been considered, but are not persuasive. Contrary to the response (pages 3-5), the "profile-sawn contours" encompass "simple vertical cuts", since claim 1 does not limit the scope of "profile" of the "contours". Perhaps the scope of "profile" in claim 1 is broader than intended.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 14, 15 and 17 are objected to as dependent upon rejected but would be allowable over the art of record, which does not show nor would have suggested these claims taken as a whole, if each were put in completed form as independent claims including all limitations of claims 1, 2; 1, 3; 1, 5; 1, 14; 1, 15; 1, 17.

This action is **FINAL**.

This action is a **final rejection** and is intended to close the prosecution of this application. Applicant's reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to this action is limited either to an appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences or to an amendment complying with the requirements set forth below.

If applicant should desire to appeal any rejection made by the examiner, a Notice of Appeal must be filed within the period for reply identifying the rejected claim or claims appealed. The Notice of Appeal must be accompanied by the required appeal fee of appropriate amount.

If applicant should desire to file an amendment, entry of a proposed amendment after final rejection cannot be made as a matter of right unless it merely cancels claims or complies with a formal requirement made earlier. Amendments touching the merits of the application which otherwise might not be proper may be admitted upon a showing a good and sufficient reasons why they are necessary and why they were not presented earlier.

A reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection must include the appeal from, or cancellation of, each rejected claim. The filing , whichever is longer, of an amendment after final rejection, whether or not it is entered, does not stop the running of the statutory period for reply to the final rejection unless the examiner holds the claims to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, if a Notice of Appeal has not been filed properly within the period for reply, or any extension of this period obtained under either 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b), the application will become abandoned.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Munson
(703) 308-4925 or 0956
06/02/03

Gene M. Munson

GENE M. MUNSON
EXAMINER
GROUP ART UNIT 2811